JS 44 (Rev. 09/11)

## **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 civil coversheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Third Degree Films, Inc.				DEFENDANT John Does 1-7	S			
a	EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF C			County of Residenc	(IN U.S. IN LAND O THE TRAC	PLAINTIFF CASES	Montgomery Co ONLY) CASES, USE THE LOC LVED.	O
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Fiore & Barber, LLC, 42 (215) 256-0205	5 Main Street, Suite 20	00, Harleysville, PA,	19438	Attorneys (If Known	)			
II. BASIS OF JURISD	OICTION (Place an "X"	in One Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF I	PRINCIP	AL PARTIES	(Place on "V" in One E	lou for DI-inst
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	<b>Ճ</b> 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government			(For Diversity Cases Only) I	PTF DEF	Incorporated or Pr	and One Box for Defa PTF incipal Place	endant) DEF
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizens)	nip of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	2 0 2	Incorporated and I of Business In A		5 🗖 5
IV. NATURE OF SUI	Γ (Place an "X" in One Box (	2.41		n or Subject of a	3 0 3	Foreign Nation	0	6 🗆 6
CONTRACT	The second secon	ORTS	FO	RFEITURE/PENALTY	RAN	NKRUPTCY	OTHER CTAS	OF IMPO
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment ∞ Enforcement of Judgmen □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise    REAL PROPERTY   □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 360 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice  CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations	PERSONAL INJURY  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability  367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability  PERSONAL PROPERT  370 Other Fraud  371 Truth in Lending  380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability  PRISONER PETITIONS  510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Othe 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detaince - Conditions of	7   62:   69:   69:   710   720   740   751   790   791	Department of Property 21 USC 881 of Prair Labor Standards Act of Pamily and Medical Leave Act of Pamily and Medical Leave Act of Uther Labor Litigation Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act of Medical Leave Act of Pamily Act of Property Act of Proper	□ 422 Appe □ 423 With 28 U  PROPEI ■ 820 Copy □ 830 Paten □ 840 Trade  SOCIAL □ 861 HIA ( □ 862 Black □ 863 DIW( □ 864 SSID ( □ 867 RSI ( □ 870 Taxes or De □ 871 IRS— 26 US	cal 28 USC 158 drawal USC 157  RTY RIGHTS Trights at emark  SECURITY (1395ff) C Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI 405(g))  AL TAX SUITS (U.S. Plaintiff efendant)	OTHER STAT  375 False Claims 6400 State Reappor 410 Antitrust  430 Banks and Bat  450 Commerce  460 Deportation  470 Racketeer Infl Corrupt Organ  480 Consumer Cre  490 Cable/Sat TV  850 Securities/Con Exchange  890 Other Statutor  891 Agricultural A  893 Environmental  895 Freedom of In: Act  896 Arbitration  899 Administrative Act/Review or Agency Decisis  950 Constitutionali State Statutes	Act tionment nking uenced and izations dit nmodities/ y Actions ets Matters formation  Procedure Appeal of on
		Confinement  Remanded from  Appellate Court	4 Reinst	alcu of D 3 anothe	ferred from	□ 6 Multidistric	et	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta	tute under which you are use:	Reope filing (D	neu (specifi	,)	Litigation versity):		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER F.R.C.P.	IS A CLASS ACTION	DE: 150,00	MAND \$ 0.00		HECK YES only it	f demanded in comple	
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE	1		DOCKET	NUMBER		
7 10 12		SIGNATURE OF ATTO	ORNEY OF	RECORD				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY  RECEIPT # AM	OUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUDO	ìE	

### 

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

assignment to appropriate calendar.	1. CA 01204
Address of Plaintiff: 9035 Independence Avenue, Canoga Par Address of Defendant: John Doe #1 - Norristown, PA	rk, CA 91304
	24 1 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: All infringements occurred (Use Reverse Side Fo.	Within this jurisdictional district.  r Additional Space)
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation	n and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(	(a)) Yes□ No  Yes□ No
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes□ No <b>X</b>
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one	2000 March 1990 March
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior	Yes□ No.X
action in this court?	suit pending or within one year previously terminated
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier	Yes□ No <b>X</b>
terminated action in this court?	
	Yes□ No <b>X</b>
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rig	hts case filed by the same individual?
	Yes□ No <b>∑</b>
CIVIL: (Place / in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)	
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases;
1.   Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	□ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
2. □ FELA	
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	2. □ Airplane Personal Injury
4. □ Antitrust	3. □ Assault, Defamation
5. □ Patent	4. □ Marine Personal Injury
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
7. □ Civil Rights	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify)
8.   Habeas Corpus	7. □ Products Liability
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases	8.   Products Liability — Asbestos
	9. □ All other Diversity Cases
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)
11. X All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify)	
ARBITRATION CERT	CAPICA TION
. Christopher P Figre (Check Appropriate C	ategory)
counsel of record do hereby certi	fy:
□ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;	belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of
□ Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	
DATE: 7/10/12	83018
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I D #
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if the	re has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or except as noted above.	within one year previously terminated action in this court
DATE:	
CIV. 609 (5/2012)	Attorney I.D.#

## 

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

Address of Plaintiff: 9035 Independence Avenue, Canoga Par	with CA 01204
Address of Defendant: John Doe #1 - Norristown, PA	rk, CA 91304
	24 . 4
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: All infringements occurred (Use Reverse Side Foi	Within this jurisdictional district.
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation	
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(	(a)) Yes□ No X
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes□ No <b>X</b>
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one	CONTROL CONTRO
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior action in this court?	Yes□ No <b>X</b> r suit pending or within one year previously terminated
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a retest about 1.	Yes□ No <b>X</b>
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier terminated action in this court?	
asilon in this court.	Yes□ No <b>X</b>
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rig	hts case filed by the same individual?
	Yes□ No. X
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)	988 <b>A</b> A
A. Federal Question Cases:	
1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:
2. □ FELA	<ol> <li>□ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts</li> </ol>
	2. □ Airplane Personal Injury
3.   Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. □ Assault, Defamation
4. □ Antitrust	4. □ Marine Personal Injury
5. Patent	5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify)
7. □ Civil Rights	7. □ Products Liability
8.   Habeas Corpus	8. □ Products Liability — Asbestos
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)
11. X All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify)	
A DRIVEN A WAY AND THE	Why o i many
ARBITRATION CERT (Check Appropriate Counsel of record do hereby certification)  (Check Appropriate Counsel of record do hereby certification)	ategory)
□ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; □ Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of
DATE: 7/0 0	83018
Attorney-at-Law  NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if the	Attorney I.D.# ere has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or except as noted above.	within one year previously terminated action in this court
DATE:	
CIV. 609 (5/2012) Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

# CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

CIVIL ACTION

Third Degree Films, Inc.

John Does 1	-7	NO.			
filing the complaint and serve side of this form.) In the e designation, that defendant s	e a copy on all defendant vent that a defendant d hall, with its first appea ties, a Case Management	Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of s. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse oes not agree with the plaintiff regarding said rance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on at Track Designation Form specifying the track assigned.			
SELECT ONE OF THE FO	OLLOWING CASE MA	ANAGEMENT TRACKS:			
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.					
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.					
(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.					
(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.					
commonly referred to as	complex and that need s	tracks (a) through (d) that are special or intense management by ailed explanation of special  (X)			
(f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.					
7/10/12 Date	Christopher P. Fic				
(215) 256-0205	(215) 256-9205	CFiore@FioreBarber.com			
Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address			

(Civ. 660) 10/02

EASTERN DISTRI	CT OF PENNSYLVANIA			
		X		
THIRD DEGREE EI	I MC INC	:		
THIRD DEGREE FILMS, INC.,		:	Civil Action No.	
	Plaintiff,	:	Civil Action No.	
		:		
JOHN DOES 1-7,	VS.	:		
		:		
TOTAL BOLD 1 7,		•		
	Defendants.	:		
		:		
		X		

# COMPLAINT-ACTION FOR DAMAGES FOR PROPERTY RIGHTS INFRINGMENT

Plaintiff, Third Degree Films, Inc., by and through its counsel, Fiore & Barber, LLC, sues John Does 1-7, and alleges:

#### Introduction

- This matter arises under the United States Copyright Act of 1976, as amended, 17
   U.S.C. §§ 101 et seq. (the "Copyright Act").
- 2. Each of the Defendants copied and distributed a website containing 35 federally registered copyrighted movies owned by Plaintiff. This is known as a "siterip."
  - 3. Through this suit, Plaintiff alleges each Defendant is liable for:
  - Direct copyright infringement in violation of 17 U.S.C. §§ 106 and 501; and
  - Contributory copyright infringement.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

#### **Jurisdiction And Venue**

- 4. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question); and 28 U.S.C. § 1338 (patents, copyrights, trademarks and unfair competition).
- 5. As set forth on Exhibit A, each of the Defendants' acts of copyright infringement occurred using an Internet Protocol address ("IP address") traced to a physical address located within this District, and therefore this Court has personal jurisdiction over each Defendant because each Defendant committed the tortious conduct alleged in this Complaint in the Eastern District of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and (a) each Defendant resides in the Eastern District of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and/or (b) each Defendant has engaged in continuous and systematic business activity, or has contracted to supply goods or services in the Eastern District of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
- 6. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c), because: (i) a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in this District; and, (ii) a Defendant resides (and therefore can be found) in this District and all of the Defendants reside in this State; additionally, venue is proper in this District pursuant 28 U.S.C. § 1400(a) (venue for copyright cases) because each Defendant or each Defendant's agent resides or may be found in this District.

#### **Parties**

- 7. Plaintiff is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California and has its principal place of business located at 9035 Independence Avenue Canoga Park, CA 91304.
  - 8. Each Defendant is known to Plaintiff only by an IP address.
  - 9. An IP address is a number that is assigned by an Internet Service Provider (an

"ISP") to devices, such as computers, that are connected to the Internet.

10. The ISP to which each Defendant subscribes can correlate the Defendant's IP address to the Defendant's true identity.

#### Joinder

11. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 20(a)(2), each of the Defendants was properly joined because, as set forth in more detail below, Plaintiff asserts that: (a) each of the Defendants is jointly and severally liable for the infringing activities of each of the other Defendants, and (b) the infringement complained of herein by each of the Defendants was part of a series of transactions, involving the exact same torrent file containing of Plaintiff's copyrighted Works, and was accomplished by the Defendants acting in concert with each other, and (c) there are common questions of law and fact; indeed, the claims against each of the Defendants are identical and each of the Defendants used the BitTorrent protocol to infringe Plaintiff's copyrighted Works.

#### Factual Background

- I. Plaintiff Owns the Copyright to a Motion Picture
- 12. An internet screen shot from <a href="www.copyright.gov">www.copyright.gov</a> of each of the 35 Registrations is attached as Composite Exhibit B.
- 13. Collectively, each of the 35 movies covered by the 35 Registrations are referred to as the "Works."
- 14. Each of the Works were on a website that was converted into are in a single torrent file, as evidenced by a single unique Cryptographic Hash Value (the "Unique Hash Number").

- 15. Each of the Defendants copied and distributed, through the BitTorrent protocol, the exact same torrent file, as evidenced by a single unique Cryptographic Hash Value, which contained Plaintiff's 35 registered works.
- 16. The date on which the United States Copyright Office Registered the works and the date IPP Limited recorded each Defendant's infringement is set forth on Exhibit C. Exhibit C demonstrates that each infringement occurred after the registration date.

## II. <u>Defendants Used BitTorrent To Infringe Plaintiff's Copyright</u>

- 17. BitTorrent is one of the most common peer-to-peer file sharing protocols (in other words, set of computer rules) used for distributing large amounts of data; indeed, it has been estimated that users using the BitTorrent protocol on the internet account for over a quarter of all internet traffic. The creators and user's of BitTorrent developed their own lexicon for use when talking about BitTorrent; a copy of the BitTorrent vocabulary list posted on <a href="https://www.wikipedia.com">www.wikipedia.com</a> is attached as Exhibit D.
- 18. The BitTorrent protocol's popularity stems from its ability to distribute a large file without creating a heavy load on the source computer and network. In short, to reduce the load on the source computer, rather than downloading a file from a single source computer (one computer directly connected to another), the BitTorrent protocol allows users to join a "swarm" of host computers to download and upload from each other simultaneously (one computer connected to numerous computers).
  - A. <u>Each Defendant Installed a BitTorrent Client onto his or her Computer</u>
  - 19. Each Defendant installed a BitTorrent Client onto his or her computer.
- 20. A BitTorrent "Client" is a software program that implements the BitTorent protocol. There are numerous such software programs including µTorrent and Vuze, both of

4

which can be directly downloaded from the internet. <u>See www.utorrent.com</u> and <a href="http://new.vuze-downloads.com/">http://new.vuze-downloads.com/</a>.

- 21. Once installed on a computer, the BitTorrent "Client" serves as the user's interface during the process of uploading and downloading data using the BitTorrent protocol.
  - B. The Initial Seed, Torrent, Hash and Tracker
- 22. A BitTorrent user that wants to upload a new file, known as an "initial seeder," starts by creating a "torrent" descriptor file using the Client he or she installed onto his or her computer.
- 23. The Client takes the target computer file, the "initial seed," here the subject website containing the copyrighted Works, and divides it into groups of bits known as "pieces."
- 24. The Client then gives each one of the computer file's pieces, in this case, pieces of the copyrighted Works, a random and unique alphanumeric identifier known as a "<u>hash</u>" and records these hash identifiers in the torrent file.
- 25. When another peer later receives a particular piece, the hash identifier for that piece is compared to the hash identifier recorded in the torrent file for that piece to test that the piece is error-free. In this way, the hash identifier works like an electronic fingerprint to identify the source and origin of the piece and that the piece is authentic and uncorrupted.
- 26. Torrent files also have an "announce" section, which specifies the <u>URL</u> (Uniform Resource Locator) of a "tracker," and an "info" section, containing (suggested) names for the files, their lengths, the piece length used, and the <u>hash identifier</u> for each piece, all of which are used by Clients on peer computers to verify the integrity of the data they receive.
- 27. The "tracker" is a computer or set of computers that a torrent file specifies and to which the torrent file provides peers with the URL address(es).

5

- 28. The tracker computer or computers direct a peer user's computer to other peer user's computers that have particular pieces of the file, here the copyrighted Works, on them and facilitates the exchange of data among the computers.
- 29. Depending on the BitTorrent Client, a tracker can either be a dedicated computer (centralized tracking) or each peer can act as a tracker (decentralized tracking).

### C. <u>Torrent Sites</u>

- 30. "Torrent sites" are websites that index torrent files that are currently being made available for copying and distribution by people using the BitTorrent protocol. There are numerous torrent websites, including <a href="www.TorrentZap.com">www.TorrentZap.com</a>, <a href="www.Btscene.com">www.Btscene.com</a>, <a href="www.Btscene.com">www.Btscene.c
- 31. Upon information and belief, each Defendant went to a torrent site to upload and download Plaintiff's copyrighted Works.
  - D. <u>Uploading and Downloading Works Through a BitTorrent Swarm</u>
- 32. Once the initial seeder has created a torrent and uploaded it onto a torrent site then other peers begin to download and upload the computer file to which the torrent is linked (here the copyrighted Works) using the BitTorrent protocol and BitTorrent Client that the peers installed on their computers.
- 33. The BitTorrent protocol causes the initial seed's computer to send different pieces of the computer file, here the copyrighted Works, to the peers seeking to download the computer file.
- 34. Once a peer receives a piece of the computer file, here a piece of the Copyrighted Works, it starts transmitting that piece to the other peers.

6

- 35. In this way, all of the peers and seeders are working together in what is called a "swarm."
- 36. Here, each Defendant peer member participated in the same swarm and directly interacted and communicated with other members of that swarm through digital handshakes, the passing along of computer instructions, uploading and downloading, and by other types of transmissions.
- 37. In this way, and by way of example only, one initial seeder can create a torrent that breaks a movie up into hundreds or thousands of pieces saved in the form of a computer file, like the Works here, upload the torrent onto a torrent site, and deliver a different piece of the copyrighted work to each of the peers. The recipient peers then automatically begin delivering the piece they just received to the other peers in the same swarm.
- 38. Once a peer, here a Defendant, has downloaded the full file, the BitTorrent Client reassembles the pieces and the peer is able to view the movie.
  - E. Plaintiff's Computer Investigators Identified Each of the Defendants' IP Addresses as Participants in a Swarm That Was Distributing Plaintiff's Copyrighted Works
- 39. Plaintiff retained IPP, Limited ("IPP") to identify the IP addresses that are being used by those people that are using the BitTorrent protocol and the internet to reproduce, distribute, display or perform Plaintiffs' copyrighted works.
- 40. IPP used forensic software named INTERNATIONAL IPTRACKER v1.2.1 and related technology enabling the scanning of peer-to-peer networks for the presence of infringing transactions.
- 41. IPP extracted the resulting data emanating from the investigation, reviewed the evidence logs, and isolated the transactions and the IP addresses associated therewith for the file

identified by the SHA-1 hash value of 6B70494F5C2FAC53634DB4E1670C6950988B735C (the "Unique Hash Number").

- 42. The IP addresses, Unique Hash Number and hit dates contained on Exhibit A accurately reflect what is contained in the evidence logs, and show:
  - (A) Each Defendant had copied a piece of Plaintiff's copyrighted Works identified by the Unique Hash Number; and
  - (B) Therefore, each Defendant was part of the same series of transactions.
- 43. Through each of the transactions, each of the Defendant's computers used their identified IP addresses to connect to the investigative server from a computer in this District in order to transmit a full copy, or a portion thereof, of a digital media file identified by the Unique Hash Number.
- 44. IPP's agent analyzed each BitTorrent "piece" distributed by each IP address listed on Exhibit A and verified that re-assemblage of the pieces using a BitTorrent Client results in a fully playable digital motion picture of the Works.
- 45. IPP's agent viewed the Works side-by-side with the digital media file that correlates to the Unique Hash Number and determined that they were identical, strikingly similar or substantially similar.

#### **Miscellaneous**

- 46. All conditions precedent to bringing this action have occurred or been waived.
- 47. Plaintiff retained counsel to represent it in this matter and is obligated to pay said counsel a reasonable fee for its services.

# COUNT I <u>Direct Infringement Against Does 1-7</u>

48. The allegations contained in paragraphs 1-47 are hereby re-alleged as if fully set

forth herein.

- 49. Plaintiff is the owner of the copyrights for the Works, each of which contains an original work of authorship.
- 50. By using the BitTorrent protocol and a BitTorrent Client and the processes described above, each Defendant copied the constituent elements of the Works that are original.
  - 51. Plaintiff did not authorize, permit or consent to Defendants' copying of its Works.
  - 52. As a result of the foregoing, each Defendant violated Plaintiff's exclusive right to:
  - (A) Reproduce the Works in copies, in violation of 17 U.S.C. §§ 106(1) and 501;
- (B) Redistribute copies of the Works to the public by sale or other transfer of ownership, or by rental, lease or lending, in violation of 17 U.S.C. §§ 106(3) and 501;
- (C) Perform the copyrighted Works, in violation of 17 U.S.C. §§ 106(4) and 501, by showing the Works' images in any sequence and/or by making the sounds accompanying the Works audible and transmitting said performance of the Works, by means of a device or process, to members of the public capable of receiving the display (as set forth in 17 U.S.C. § 101's definitions of "perform" and "publically" perform); and
- (D) Display the copyrighted Works, in violation of 17 U.S.C. §§ 106(5) and 501, by showing individual images of the Works nonsequentially and transmitting said display of the Works by means of a device or process to members of the public capable of receiving the display (as set forth in 17 U.S.C. § 101's definition of "publically" display).
- 53. Each of the Defendants' infringements was committed "willfully" within the meaning of 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2).
- 54. Plaintiff has suffered actual damages that were proximately caused by each of the Defendants including lost sales, price erosion and a diminution of the value of its copyrights.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court:

- (A) Permanently enjoin each Defendant and all other persons who are in active concert or participation with each Defendant from continuing to infringe Plaintiff's copyrighted Works;
- (B) Order that each Defendant delete and permanently remove the torrent file relating to Plaintiff's copyrighted Works from each of the computers under each such Defendant's possession, custody or control;
- (C) Order that each Defendant delete and permanently remove the copy of the Works each Defendant has on the computers under Defendant's possession, custody or control;
- (D) Award Plaintiff the greater of: (i) statutory damages in the amount of \$150,000 per Defendant, per registered Work infringed, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504-(a) and (c), or (ii) Plaintiff's actual damages and any additional profits of the Defendant pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504-(a)-(b);
- (E) Award Plaintiff its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 505; and
  - (F) Grant Plaintiff any other and further relief this Court deems just and proper.

# COUNT II Contributory Infringement Against Does 1-7

- 55. The allegations contained in paragraphs 1-47 are hereby re-alleged as if fully set forth herein.
- 56. Plaintiff is the owner of the copyrights for the Works, each of which contains an original work of authorship.
- 57. By using the BitTorrent protocol and a BitTorrent Client and the processes described above, each Defendant copied the constituent elements of each of the Works that are

original.

- 58. By participating in the BitTorrent swarm with the other Defendants, each Defendant induced, caused or materially contributed to the infringing conduct of each other Defendant.
- 59. Plaintiff did not authorize, permit or consent to Defendants' inducing, causing or materially contributing to the infringing conduct of each other Defendant.
- 60. Each Defendant knew or should have known that other BitTorrent users, here the other Defendants, would become members of a swarm with Defendant.
- 61. Each Defendant knew or should have known that other BitTorrent users in a swarm with it, here the other Defendants, were directly infringing Plaintiff's copyrighted Works by copying constituent elements of the Works that are original.
- 62. Indeed, each Defendant directly participated in and therefore materially contributed to each other Defendant's infringing activities.
- 63. Each of the Defendants' contributory infringements were committed "willfully" within the meaning of 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2).
- 64. Plaintiff has suffered actual damages that were proximately caused by each of the Defendants including lost sales, price erosion, and a diminution of the value of its copyright.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court:

- (A) Permanently enjoin each Defendant and all other persons who are in active concert or participation with each Defendant from continuing to infringe Plaintiff's copyrighted Works;
- (B) Order that each Defendant delete and permanently remove the torrent file relating to Plaintiff's copyrighted Works from each of the computers under each such Defendant's

possession, custody or control;

(C) Order that each Defendant delete and permanently remove the copy of the Works

each Defendant has on the computers under Defendant's possession, custody or control;

(D) Find that each Defendant is jointly and severally liable for the direct infringement

of each other Defendant;

(E) Award Plaintiff the greater of: (i) statutory damages in the amount of \$150,000

per Defendant, per registered Work infringed, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504-(a) and (c), or (ii)

Plaintiff's actual damages and any additional profits of the Defendant pursuant to 17 U.S.C. §

504-(a)-(b);

(F) Award Plaintiff its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 17 U.S.C. §

505; and

(G) Grant Plaintiff any other and further relief this Court deems just and proper.

#### **DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Respectfully submitted,

FIORE & BARBER, LLC

By:

Christopher P. Fiore, Esquire Aman M. Barber, III, Esquire Attorneys for Plaintiff 425 Main Street, Suite 200

Harleysville, PA 19438

Tel: (215) 256-0205 Fax: (215) 256-9205

Email: cfiore@fiorebarber.com

### 

SHA-1 Hash: 6B70494F5C2FAC53634DB4E1670C6950988B735C

Title: TD Siterip #1

Rights Owner: Third Degree

DOE#	IP	Hit date (UTC)	City	State	ISP	Network
		6/4/2012				
1	69.242.7.33	18:19	Norristown	PA	Comcast Cable	BitTorrent
		5/28/2012				
2	69.253.48.167	9:32	Philadelphia	PA	Comcast Cable	BitTorrent
		6/18/2012				
3	71.224.87.0	22:40	Pottstown	PA	Comcast Cable	BitTorrent
		6/13/2012				
4	71.58.17.71	0:59	North Wales	PA	Comcast Cable	BitTorrent
		6/26/2012				
5	24.102.143.180	0:05	Allentown	PA	PenTeleData	BitTorrent
		6/28/2012				
6	216.15.69.85	13:37	Northampton	PA	RCN Corporation	BitTorrent
		6/16/2012				
7	71.123.61.248	7:03	Parkesburg	PA	Verizon Internet Services	BitTorrent